

said, into the Lord's death." *Phillostergius* A. D. 364. Theodoret, an eminent historian born 363 says: "He, Eunomius, subverted the holy law of baptism which had been handed down from the beginning from the Lord and the Apostles, and made a contrary law, asserting that it is not necessary to immerse the candidate thrice, nor to mention the names of the trinity, but to immerse only once in the death of Christ." *Crystal on Baptism*. P. 78. (2) Origin of the use of the commission (Math. 28:19) in single immersion. The first case was about A. D. 600. At the first Council of Toledo where all of Spain was represented, they decided that both Single and Trine Immersion were valid. A. D. 633. See *Crystal on Baptism* PP. 144, 145. All the rest of the world practiced Trine immersion and even in Spain single immersion soon fades out in History. (3) Origin of Backward action of Single Immersion. The first case in the world was on the first day of March, 1522. Thomas Mintzer was the person baptized. More than twenty years ago there was a little church in the city of Boston who deposited \$1500 in a bank with instructions to pay it to any man who would find a case of backward single immersion before March 1, 1522. It was left there for twelve months but none were ever able to win it. Please notice this principle mode of immersion in this country is not yet four hundred years old.

6 The beginning of Sprinkling and Pouring except in cases of sickness. "How came the mode of pouring and sprinkling to take the place of immersion and emersion, as a rule, The change was gradual and confined to the western churches." *Schaff, Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. P. 51. He shows that the Catholic church began to change 1274 A. D. and in 1311, the Council of Ravenna "declared the two modes equally valid." P. 45. *Schaff*.

"The change in England and other Protestant churches from immersion to pouring and from pouring to sprinkling was encouraged by the authority of Calvin, who declared the mode to be a matter of no importance, and by the Westminster Assembly (1643-1652) which decided by a close vote of twenty five to twenty-four in favor of sprinkling. "Sprinkling (1645) was just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641; for Mr. Blake never used it nor seen it used. *Wall*. Vol. 2, P. 311. Because Calvin changed Dean Stanly felt justified in changing, and from these two churches, Presbyterian and Episcopalian, all the sprinkling of Protestantism sprang. "The word baptize means to immerse and immersion was the practice of the ancient church." *Calvin Instit.* IV. Chap. 15-19. "The original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, for at least four centuries and any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in cases of dangerous illness

as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case. A few drops of water are now the western substitute for the threefold plunge into the rushing river. Stanley's Lectures on the Eastern Church.

7. I will close with Dr. Schaff's summary of his historical investigation: (a) Trine immersion and emersion of the whole body was the general practice in the ancient church, Greek and Latin, and continues to this day in all the eastern churches and sects and in the orthodox state church in Russia." (b) "Single immersion has no proper authority in antiquity. The Protestant Baptists can appeal to the usual meaning of the Greek word, and to the testimony of antiquity, but not for single immersion." (c) "Affusion or pouring was first used in exceptional cases but came gradually into general use since the thirteenth century in the Latin church, and then in all the Protestant churches, last in England, except among Baptists who during the seventh century returned to the practice of immersion." *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, P. 54, 56. Reader if you have never been baptized by trine immersion cease making excuses and rebelling against God, and immediately obey by being baptized.

2424, N. 10th St. Phil.

A MISSIONARY THOUGHT

W. D. FURRY, B. A.

We no longer question that we ought to send missionaries to the foreign field. But since we know that the commands of Christ are neither unreasonable nor without reason the question that we now ask and rightly is, "Why should we send missionaries to the foreign field?" Many answers are given to the question but only one can be the right one. Mission work is not to be engaged in from political or commercial or social ends to be reached. We are not to send missionaries to the foreign field that we may carry to them the advantages of our own civilization. We have quite enough to do to perfect our own civilization; and there are respects in which we might be pupils rather than teachers of heathen lands. Neither are we to go that we may impose upon them our religious opinions, this is our creeds. Too much of this has already been done and missionary progress has been thwarted in consequence. There is neither scriptural ground nor justification for the making of sectaries of the Hindus, the Chinese or the Japanese. There must be some deeper reason than either of these to justify the mild sacrifices that are made at home that foreign missions may be supported and extended and the great sacrifices of those that leave their homes, their country and their opportunities for usefulness and of enjoyment and expatiate themselves in order to do christian work in foreign lands. The one reason why the church should send missionaries to the foreign field finds an eloquent setting forth in the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah, verses 9 20.

The prophet distinguishes between false religions and the true. He attempts no compromise between them. The difference is of kind not of degree alone. Christianity makes the same distinction. In paganism men make their gods; in Christendom not. Idolatry at its last analysis is god-making. The worshipper creates his own idol. He worships the product of his own brain. Whether he makes his god out of wood or stone, or pen or paper, or simply out of his own imaginings, he makes the god before whom he bows and worships.

The vice of paganism and atheism alike is *egotism*. The atheist says, "There is nothing greater in the Universe than I." The pagan says the same thing with the addition that he constructs a human imagination and makes it the object of worship. We need to emphasize the distinction made by Isaiah and emphasized anew by Jesus Christ and the Apostles. There is not a little bit of civilized paganism in the christian world. Because we have not felt deeply this distinction between the false religion and the true, our interest in the foreign work has waned and ulterior motives now actuate us in what we are doing. I am led to believe that the present indifference in the work of foreign missions is due in no small measure to the "World's Parliament of Religions," held in connection with the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893.

Our foreign work must find its justification and its inspiration in the faith that God is a living God and we know Him. First of all God is. The declaration frequently made that an honest God is the noblest work of man is false. God is not the product of man's imagining. Man in no way made him. *He is a living person*; the great I am; the self-existent one; the sublime Reality. He is "The Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed and in the presence of which we always are (Spencer) He is, "The power within us, not ourselves that makes for righteousness" (Arnold.) He is living reality, the life giving one, pouring his life into his children and making their lives richer and larger. We come to have a share in his life. Our real life is in Him. We know no life possible apart from Him. To be without Him, is to be without the source and support of life. This is the first and fundamental message that christianity has for paganism.

Our God is a living God; you are his children, shares of his life and while sin has cut you off from the Father thru Jesus Christ you can again be brought into vital relationship with Him.

And this is the second message altho we cannot comprehend God, nor define him, yet we can *know him*. He is neither the unknown or unknowable One. He has come into life in a way that can be comprehended; he has taken on him the guise of our humanity, defines himself so to speak, that we might know him better. He that is never so far as ever to be near, and who infinitely transcends all our interpretations and definitions has cast his shadow on the screen of